

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT**

**FOR:**

**VC Rowley and Associates**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	Unsatisfactory	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	3 Meets Standard	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>		<b>Instruction is clear</b>	2 Approaching Standard	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	
<b>Academic Program</b>		<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	2.5 Between Approaching Standard/Meets Standard	<b>Financial viability</b>	
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	Unsatisfactory	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	3 Meets Standard		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	Unsatisfactory	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 1-8:1 in 5 lessons but 19:1 in one lesson (for 30 minutes)</b>	2 Approaching Standard		

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since VC Rowley's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).*

**VC Rowley and Associates is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the onsite monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report. As such, VC Rowley has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.**

**ACTION NEEDED: NONE**

- Provider submitted revised progress report that included missing components noted in progress reporting section;
- Provider submitted documentation regarding planned professional development training;

- Provider submitted a corrective action plan that described the process that will be used to ensure that the student/tutor ratio at all sites will not exceed 8:1 at any given time and also included a contingency plan for what will happen when tutors are unexpectedly absent or late for tutoring sessions.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** VC Rowley & Associates  
**REVIEWER:** ST

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** January 2, 2007

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)</p>	<p>-Professional development PowerPoint -Professional development agenda</p>	<b>X</b>		<p>-Professional development PowerPoint explained provider's expectations and policies, however, beyond the initial orientation to the provider's program, it does not appear that the provider offers ongoing professional development opportunities at least 3 times a year related to teaching strategies, classroom management/discipline, analytical assessment/test administration, and resources as detailed in provider's original application; -No documentation that tutors completed the professional development training was provided.</p>
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent</p>	<p>-Progress reports -Documentation of reports sent -Copies of SES Contracts and SES Agreements/Student Learning Plans</p>	<b>X</b>		<p>- Based on progress reporting timeline and district reports, progress reports are submitted timely; -Progress reports were not consistent; not all progress reports share the same level of detail or required information; -Some progress reports were missing key information such as skills students have been working on or that students have developed, skills tutor will continue to work on with student, comments on the achievement of the original set of objectives and goals, etc. that were included in provider's approved revised progress report from last year; -Some progress reports included pre-filled in information that was not necessarily</p>

					applicable to the particular student the report was regarding as noted by the tutor's circling of the words that were applicable (which makes the report less user friendly since it is difficult for parents/teachers to decipher what information was being shared regarding their particular child/student).
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of individual learning plan development</li> <li>-Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plans</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence of assessments' connection to Indiana Academic standards</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Individual learning plans include assessment scores, suggested classroom modifications, and lists skills to be worked on and mastered by students but do not include specific plans or strategies tutor will use to address student skill gaps or areas of weakness. It is recommended that provider revise individual plans to include language regarding the specific strategies (i.e. scaffolded instruction, use of hands-on activities, etc.) that tutors will use to address each particular student's skill gaps or areas of weakness;</li> <li>-Provider's process for creating Individual Learning Plans is included but is not comprehensive as it should include details regarding the development of specific plans and strategies for addressing skill gaps and discuss how these strategies will be incorporated into individual learning plans;</li> <li>- Clear demonstration and evidence of Pre and post-test assessment correlation to Indiana academic standards was provided.</li> </ul>

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** VC Rowley & Associates

**DATE:** 12/10/07; 12/17/07 (2 sites); 12/18/07

**SITE:** Abraham Lincoln Elementary; IPS #19; IPS #64; IPS #44

**REVIEWER:** ST & MC; ST & SF (2 sites); ST & KS

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** L.S.; M.R.; rms 12A & media center; C.W.

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:45 p.m.; 4:00 p.m.; 4:50 p.m.; 4:45 p.m.

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 6

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During the six lessons observed, students worked with tutors typically in large groups (although for one lesson, one tutor was observed working one on one with a student);</li> <li>- Students worked on language arts lessons on word families, sounds, reading comprehension, and worksheets on sequencing in addition to math worksheet packets (2 students were observed working on a math board game);</li> <li>- Lessons match provider description in application, however, the lesson at one school did not appear adequately planned and organized (see instruction description below).</li> </ul>
Instruction is clear		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instruction provided to students during 3 of the 6 lessons was clear for the most part. Tutors in these lessons clearly indicated what was to be learned by students and also spent time providing individual assistance to students during independent work time. However, in 3 of the 6 lessons observed, while tutors answered student questions and reviewed student responses on worksheets, tutors were only observed giving students directions on how to complete worksheets and were not observed providing actual instruction, leading lessons or introducing concepts to teach students;</li> <li>- Communication and directions provided to students during 3 of the 6 observed lessons that were with large groups was not always clear and individualized instruction was not observed. In these lessons, tutors did not always communicate to students what is to be learned. For example, two students were asked to work on a math game which they played for over twenty minutes with no interaction with the tutor (the tutor was actively providing instruction to another group of students). When the tutor did follow-up with the students, it was evident that due to lack of clear instruction, the students had been using an incorrect method for solving the questions during the entire game;</li> <li>-In addition, during 3 of the 6 lessons observed with large group sizes, tutors were not able to utilize methods of adjusted instruction or individualize instruction for students</li> </ul>

					(i.e. no modifications were made to accommodate for different ability levels within groups). For example, at one school, the tutor introduced the lesson on main ideas but due to the large group size (19 students with 1 tutor for 30 minutes until 2 other tutors arrived), instruction was not able to be adjusted to the various age and ability levels within the group (students in at least 4-5 different grade levels received the same lesson and instruction at the same time). Another example is that with a group of Kindergarten and first graders, the tutor provided directions on how to complete a worksheet on word families for one grade level but when these students needed individual assistance during independent work time, due to the large group size, the tutor was unable to provide this assistance as he/she was working with the other grade level of students on another assignment.
COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the most part, student time on task was adequate and students appeared engaged with the lesson or task. However, during sessions with large group sizes, students had difficulty remaining on task when tutor was working with another student or other pairs of students. For example at one site, while a tutor was working with another student and the other students were instructed to work on their independent assignments, one student ate his/her snack for 20 minutes and did not engage in his/her independent work until the tutor came over to check the student's progress. At another site, while instruction was being given, students drew, colored, or did homework, 3 students socialized, and 1 student that was isolated from the group in a corner of the room was never engaged in the lesson. At yet another site, there were not enough copies of the lesson worksheet so while some students were able to follow along with the lesson others were only able to listen which often led to the students being disengaged;</li> <li>-For the most part, tutors utilized appropriate strategies to promote student time on task and redirected students who were distracted or off task.</li> </ul>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutors demonstrated an appropriate knowledge of material being presented;</li> <li>- For the most part, tutors demonstrated an appropriate knowledge of tutoring strategies and techniques. Many tutors appropriately used modified correction techniques and provided students with clues or resources to respond to questions that students had difficulty answering;</li> <li>-In large group sessions, while tutors appeared familiar with the various age and ability levels within the groups, the group size made it difficult for tutors to appropriately individualize instruction.</li> </ul>
Student/instructor ratio:1-8:1 in most sites but 19:1 for 30 minutes at one school		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Student/instructor ratio exceeded state ratio limits and the ratio approved in the original provider application in at least 1 site (for 30 minutes) but was in line with provider application (1-8:1) at all other sites.</li> </ul>